

On one generalization of finite $\mathfrak{U}$ -critical groups

Vladimir N. Semenchuk

Department of Mathematics, Francisk Skorina Gomel State University,
Gomel 246019, Belarus
E-mail: kolenchukova@gsu.by

Alexander N. Skiba

Department of Mathematics, Francisk Skorina Gomel State University,
Gomel 246019, Belarus
E-mail: alexander.skiba49@gmail.com

Abstract

A proper subgroup H of a group G is said to be: $\mathbb{P}$ -*subnormal* in G if there exists a chain of subgroups $H = H_0 < H_1 < \dots < H_n = G$ such that $|H_i : H_{i-1}|$ is a prime for $i = 1, \dots, n$; $\mathbb{P}$ -*abnormal* in G if for every two subgroups $K \leq L$ of G , where $H \leq K$, $|L : K|$ is not a prime. In this paper we describe finite groups in which every non-identity subgroup is either $\mathbb{P}$ -subnormal or $\mathbb{P}$ -abnormal.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, all groups are finite, G denotes a finite group and p is a prime. We use $\mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{U}$ to denote the classes of all nilpotent and of all supersoluble groups, respectively. A subgroup H of G is said to be a *Gaschütz* subgroup of G (Shemetkov [1, p. 170]) if H is supersoluble and $|L : K|$ is not a prime whenever $H \leq K \leq L \leq G$.

Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a class of groups. If $1 \in \mathfrak{F}$, then we write $G^{\mathfrak{F}}$ to denote the intersection of all normal subgroups N of G with $G/N \in \mathfrak{F}$. The class $\mathfrak{F}$ is said to be a *formation* if either $\mathfrak{F} = \emptyset$ or $1 \in \mathfrak{F}$ and every homomorphic image of $G/G^{\mathfrak{F}}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{F}$ for any group G . The formation $\mathfrak{F}$ is said to be: *saturated* if $G \in \mathfrak{F}$ whenever $G^{\mathfrak{F}} \leq \Phi(G)$; *hereditary* if $H \in \mathfrak{F}$ whenever $G \in \mathfrak{F}$ and H is a subgroup of G .

A group G is said to be $\mathfrak{F}$ -*critical* if G is not in $\mathfrak{F}$ but all proper subgroups of G are in $\mathfrak{F}$ [2, p. 517]. An $\mathfrak{N}$ -critical group is also called a *Schmidt group*.

⁰Keywords: finite group, $\mathbb{P}$ -subnormal subgroup, $\mathbb{P}$ -abnormal subgroup, $\mathfrak{U}$ -critical group, Gaschütz subgroup, Hall subgroup

⁰Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 20D10, 20D15, 20D20

A proper subgroup H of G is said to be: $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G if there exists a chain of subgroups $H = H_0 < H_1 < \dots < H_n = G$ such that H_{i-1} is a maximal subgroup of H_i and $H_i/(H_{i-1})_{H_i} \in \mathfrak{F}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$; $\mathfrak{F}$ -abnormal in G if $L/K_L \notin \mathfrak{F}$ whenever $H \leq K < L \leq G$ and K is a maximal subgroup of L . A group $G \notin \mathfrak{F}$ is said to be an $E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ -group [3] if every non-identity subgroup of G is either $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal or $\mathfrak{F}$ -abnormal in G .

In [4], Fattahi described groups in which every subgroup is either normal or abnormal. As a generalization of this result, Ebert and Bauman classified the $E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ -groups in the case when $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{N}$ (in this case G is a group in which every subgroup is either subnormal or abnormal), and in the case when $\mathfrak{F}$ is the class of all soluble p -nilpotent groups, for odd prime p [3]. In the future, the $E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ -groups were studied for some other $\mathfrak{F}$ (see for example [5, 6, 7, 8]). Nevertheless, it should be noted that a complete description of the $E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ -groups was obtained only for such cases $\mathfrak{F}$ when every $\mathfrak{F}$ -critical group is a Schmidt group [4, 6, 7, 8]). Thus, for example in the case, where $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{U}$, the structure of $E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ -groups has not been known since the methods in [4, 5, 6, 7, 8] could not be used in the analysis of this case.

Note, in passing, that if G is soluble and H is a subgroup of G , then H is $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal in G if and only if there exists a chain of subgroups $H = H_0 < H_1 < \dots < H_n = G$ such that $|H_i : H_{i-1}|$ is a prime for $i = 1, \dots, n$; $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G if and only if $|L : K|$ is not a prime whenever $H \leq K \leq L \leq G$.

If G is supersoluble, then clearly every subgroup of G is $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal in G . A full description of $E_{\mathfrak{U}}$ -groups, for the non-supersoluble case, gives the following our result.

Theorem A. *Let G be an $E_{\mathfrak{U}}$ -group and $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ the supersoluble residual of G . Then $G = D \rtimes H$, where:*

- (i) *H is a Hall Gaschütz subgroup of G . Hence if H is nilpotent, then it is a Carter subgroup of G .*
- (ii) *Every chief factor of G below D is non-cyclic. Hence H is a supersoluble normalizer ($\mathfrak{U}$ -normalizer, in other words) of G in the sense of [9].*
- (iii) *$|G : DG'|$ is a prime power number.*
- (iv) *If H is not a cyclic group of prime power order p^n , where $n > 1$, then D is nilpotent.*
- (v) *$H\Phi(G)/\Phi(G)$ is either a Miller-Moreno group or an abelian group of prime power order.*
- (vi) *Every proper subgroup of G containing D is supersoluble.*

Conversely, any group satisfying the above conditions is an $E_{\mathfrak{U}}$ -group.

Corollary 1.1. *Let $G = D \rtimes H$ be an $E_{\mathfrak{U}}$ -group, where $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}$. If H is nilpotent, then it is a system normalizer of G .*

From the description of $\mathfrak{U}$ -critical groups G [10, 11] it follows that every subgroup of G containing $\Phi(G) \cap G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is either $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal or $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G (see Lemma 2.6 below). Another application

of Theorem A is the following result, which classifies all groups with such a property.

Theorem B. *Let G be a non-supersoluble group and $\Phi = \Phi(G) \cap G^{\mathfrak{A}}$. Then every non-identity subgroup of G containing Φ is either $\mathfrak{A}$ -subnormal or $\mathfrak{A}$ -abnormal in G if and only if $G = D \rtimes H$ is a soluble group, where H is a Hall subgroup of G such that $H\Phi/\Phi$ is a Gaschütz subgroup of G , and with respect to G Assertions (iii)–(vi) in Theorem A hold.*

All unexplained notation and terminology are standard. The reader is referred to [12], [2], [13], or [14] if necessary.

2 Preliminaries

The following lemma collects some well-known properties of $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal subgroups which will be used in our proofs.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a hereditary saturated formation, H and K the subgroups of G and H is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G .*

- (1) $H \cap K$ is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in K [14, 6.1.7(2)].
- (2) If N is a normal subgroup in G , then HN/N is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G/N . [14, 6.1.6(3)].
- (3) If K is an $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal subgroup of H , then K is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G [14, 6.1.6(1)].
- (4) If $G^{\mathfrak{F}} \leq K$, then K is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G [14, 6.1.7(1)].
- (5) If $K \leq H$ and $H \in \mathfrak{F}$, then K is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G .

A minimal normal subgroup R of G is called $\mathfrak{F}$ -central in G provided $R \rtimes (G/C_G(R)) \in \mathfrak{F}$, otherwise it is called $\mathfrak{F}$ -eccentric in G .

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a formation and M a maximal subgroup of G . Let R be a minimal normal subgroup of G such that $MR = G$. Then $G/M_G \in \mathfrak{F}$ if and only if R is $\mathfrak{F}$ -central in G .*

Proof. In view of the G -isomorphism $R \simeq RM_G/M_G$ we can assume without loss of generality that $M_G = 1$. Let $C = C_G(R)$.

If $G \simeq G/M_G \in \mathfrak{F}$, then R is $\mathfrak{F}$ -central in G by the Barnes-Kegel's Theorem [2, IV, 1.5]. Now let $R \rtimes (G/C) \in \mathfrak{F}$. First assume that R is non-abelian. If R is the unique minimal normal subgroup of G , then $C = 1$ and so $G \in \mathfrak{F}$. Now let G have a minimal normal subgroup $L \neq R$. Then, since $M_G = 1$, $G = R \rtimes M = L \rtimes M$ and $C = L$ by [2, A, 15.2]. Hence $M \simeq G/L \simeq G/R \in \mathfrak{F}$ and so $G \in \mathfrak{F}$ since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a formation.

Finally, if R is an abelian p -group, then $C = R$ by [2, A, 15.2] and so $G \simeq G/M_G \simeq R \rtimes (G/R) \in \mathfrak{F}$. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.3 (See Lemma 2.15 in [15]). *Let E be a normal non-identity quasinilpotent subgroup of G . If $\Phi(G) \cap E = 1$, then E is the direct product of some minimal normal subgroups of G .*

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a non-empty hereditary saturated formation, G an $E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ -group and $D = G^{\mathfrak{F}}$.*

- (i) *Every $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal subgroup of G belongs to $\mathfrak{F}$.*
- (ii) *$F^*(G) \leq D\Phi(G)$.*

Proof. (i) Let H be any $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal subgroup of G and K a maximal subgroup of H . Then K is not $\mathfrak{F}$ -abnormal, so it is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G by hypothesis. Hence K is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in H by Lemma 2.1.(1), that is, $H/K_H \in \mathfrak{F}$. Therefore, since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a saturated formation, $H \in \mathfrak{F}$.

(ii) Without loss of generality we can assume that $\Phi(G) = 1$. In this case $F^*(G) = N_1 \times \cdots \times N_t$ for some minimal normal subgroups $N_1, \dots, N_t$ of G by Lemma 2.3. Let $N = N_i$ and M be a maximal subgroup of G such that $G = MN$. Assume that M is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G . Then $D \leq M_G$, so N is $\mathfrak{F}$ -central in G by Lemma 2.2. On the other hand, Assertion (i) implies that $M \in \mathfrak{F}$. Thus $G/N \simeq M/M \cap N \in \mathfrak{F}$ and so $G \simeq G/N \cap M_G \in \mathfrak{F}$. This contradiction shows that M is $\mathfrak{F}$ -abnormal in G , so $G/M_G \notin \mathfrak{F}$. Hence $N \leq D$ by Lemma 2.2. Therefore $F^*(G) \leq D$. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a non-empty formation, G an $\mathfrak{F}$ -critical group and $D = G^{\mathfrak{F}}$.*

- (i) *If G is soluble, then D is a p -group for some prime p .*
- (ii) *If $\mathfrak{F}$ is saturated and D is soluble, then the following statements hold:*
 - (a) *D is a p -group for some prime p .*
 - (b) *$D/\Phi(D)$ is a chief factor of G .*

Proof. (i) Since G is soluble, $\Phi(G) < F(G)$. Hence for some prime p we have $O_p(G) \not\leq \Phi(G)$. Let M be a maximal subgroup of G such that $G = O_p(G)M$. Then $G/O_p(G) = O_p(G)M/O_p(G) \simeq M/M \cap O_p(G) \in \mathfrak{F}$ since G is an $\mathfrak{F}$ -critical group. Thus $D \leq O_p(G)$.

(ii) See Theorem 24.2 in [1, V] or [2, VII, 6.18]. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a hereditary saturated formation and G an $\mathfrak{F}$ -critical soluble group. Then every subgroup of G containing $\Phi(G) \cap G^{\mathfrak{F}}$ is either $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal or $\mathfrak{F}$ -abnormal in G .*

Proof. It is enough to consider the case when $\Phi(G) \cap G^{\mathfrak{F}} = 1$. By Lemma 2.5, D is a minimal normal subgroup of G . Let A be any non-identity subgroup of G . First assume that $DA < G$. Then $DA \in \mathfrak{F}$, and DA is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G by Lemma 2.1(4). Hence A is $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal in G by Lemma 2.1(3). Now assume that $DA = G$. Then A is a maximal subgroup of G , so A is $\mathfrak{F}$ -abnormal in G . The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.7 (Friesen [17, 4, 3.4]). *If $G = AB$, where A and B are normal supersoluble subgroups of G and $(|G : A|, |G : B|) = 1$, then G is supersoluble.*

We shall need the following special case of Theorem C in [15].

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a hereditary saturated formation containing all nilpotent groups and E a normal subgroup of G . If $E/E \cap \Phi(G) \in \mathcal{F}$, then $E \in \mathcal{F}$.*

A subgroup H of G is said to be: $\mathbb{P}$ -subnormal in G [18, 19] if there exists a chain of subgroups

$H = H_0 < H_1 < \cdots < H_n = G$ such that $|H_i : H_{i-1}|$ is a prime for $i = 1, \dots, n$; $\mathbb{P}$ -*abnormal* in G if $|L : K|$ is not a prime whenever $H \leq K \leq L \leq G$. We say that H satisfies the $\mathbb{P}$ -*property* in G if H is either $\mathbb{P}$ -subnormal or $\mathbb{P}$ -abnormal in G .

Lemma 2.9. (i) *If every non-identity subgroup of G of prime order satisfies the $\mathbb{P}$ -property in G , then G is not a simple non-abelian group.*

(ii) *If every non-identity cyclic subgroup of G of prime power order satisfies the $\mathbb{P}$ -property in G , then G is soluble.*

Proof. (i) Suppose that this is false and let p be the smallest prime dividing $|G|$. Then a Sylow p -subgroup P of G is not cyclic. Let H be a subgroup of order p in P . Then $H < P$, so by hypothesis, G has a maximal subgroup M such that $H \leq M$ and $|G : M| = q$ for some prime q . Since G is a simple non-abelian group, $M_G = 1$ and by considering the permutation representation of G on the right cosets of H , we see that G is isomorphic to some subgroup of the symmetric group S_q of degree q . Hence q is the largest prime divisor of $|G|$ and $|Q| = q$, where Q is a Sylow q -subgroup Q of G . It follows that $q \neq p$. It is clear that G is not q -nilpotent, so it has a q -closed Schmidt subgroup H such that $Q \leq H$ by [16, IV, 5.4]. Since Q is normal in H , it is P -subnormal in G by hypothesis. Hence G has a maximal subgroup T such that $Q \leq T$ and $|G : T| = r$ is a prime. But then r is the largest prime dividing $|G|$ and so $r = q$, a contradiction. Hence we have (i).

(ii) Since the hypothesis clearly holds for every quotient of G and every normal subgroup of G , this assertion is a corollary of Assertion (i). The lemma is proved.

3 Proofs of Theorems A and B

Proof of Theorem A. *Necessity.* Suppose that this is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Let $\pi = \pi(D)$.

(1) *The hypothesis holds on G/R for every normal subgroup R of G not containing D .*

First note that $G/R \notin \mathfrak{U}$ since $D \not\leq R$. Therefore this claim is a corollary of Lemma 2.1(2).

(2) *Every subgroup E of G containing D is supersoluble. Hence G is soluble.*

First note that the hypothesis holds for D , so D is soluble by Lemma 2.9. On the other hand, E is $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal in G by Lemma 2.1(4) and so E is supersoluble by Lemma 2.4(i). Hence we have (2).

(3) *D is a Hall subgroup of G .*

Suppose that this is false and let P be a Sylow p -subgroup of D such that $1 < P < G_p$, where G_p is a Sylow p -subgroup of G . Then $|G_p| > p$. Let R be a minimal normal subgroup of G .

(a) *R is a p -group. Hence $O_{p'}(G) = 1$.*

Since G is soluble by Claim (2), R is a q -group for some prime q . Moreover, $DR/R = (G/R)^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is

a Hall subgroup of G by the choice of G since the hypothesis holds for G/R by Claim (1). Therefore every Sylow r -subgroup of D , where $r \neq q$, is a Sylow subgroup of G . Hence $q = p$ and so $O_{p'}(G) = 1$.

(b) *If $R \leq D$, then R is a Sylow p -subgroup of D . If $R \cap D = 1$, then $G_p = R \rtimes P$.*

Assume $R \leq D$. Then $R \leq P$ and P/R is a Sylow p -subgroup of D/R . If $P/R \neq 1$, then Claim (1) and the choice of G imply that $P/R = G_p/R$ and so $P = G_p$. This contradiction shows that $P = R$ is a Sylow p -subgroup of D .

Now assume that $R \not\leq D$. Then $RP/R = G_p/R$ since $DR/R = (G/R)^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a Hall subgroup of G/R by Claim (1), so $G_p = R \rtimes P$ since $R \cap D = 1$.

(c) *$R \not\leq \Phi(G)$. Hence $\Phi(G) = 1$.*

Assume that $R \leq \Phi(G)$. If $R \cap D = 1$, then $G_p = R \rtimes P$ by Claim (b) and so $R \not\leq \Phi(G)$ by the Gaschütz Theorem [16, I, 17.4]. This contradiction shows that $R \leq D$, so R is the Sylow p -subgroup of D by Claim (b). Hence D/R is a p' -group, so a p -complement S of D is normal in G by Lemma 2.8. But then $S \leq O_{p'}(G) = 1$. Hence $D = R$ and so G is supersoluble since $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}$, a contradiction. Thus we have (c).

(d) *G_p is normal in G .*

Let E be any normal maximal subgroup of G containing D with $|G : E| = q$. Then $O_{p'}(E) \leq O_{p'}(G) = 1$, so p is the largest prime dividing $|E|$ since E is supersoluble by Claim (2). If $q \neq p$, then $G_p \leq E$ and so G_p is normal in G since in this case G_p is a characteristic subgroup of E .

Finally, assume that $q = p$. Then p is the largest prime dividing $|G|$ and so DG_p is normal in G since $G/D = G/G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is supersoluble. If $DG_p \neq G$, we can get as above that G_p is normal in G . Now assume that $DG_p = G$. Since $R \not\leq \Phi(G)$ by Claim (c), it has a complement in G and so R has a complement V in G_p . It is clear that V is not $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G , so for some maximal $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal subgroup M of G we have $V \leq M$, which implies that $G = DV \leq M$. This contradiction shows that the case under consideration is impossible. Hence G_p is normal in G .

Final contradiction for (3). In view of Claim (d), $\Phi(G_p) \leq \Phi(G) = 1$. Therefore, by the Maschke's Theorem, G has a minimal normal subgroup $L \not\leq \Phi(G)$ such that $L \leq G_p$ and $L \not\leq D$. Then $|L| = p$ and for some maximal subgroup M of G we have $G = LM$. Hence G/M_G is supersoluble by Lemma 2.3, which implies that $D \leq M$ and so M is supersoluble by Claim (2). But then G is supersoluble, a contradiction. Hence we have (3).

(4) *$F(G) \leq D\Phi(G)$ (This directly follows from Lemma 2.4(ii)).*

(5) *$|G : DG'|$ is a prime power number (Since G is not supersoluble, this directly follows from Claim (2) and Lemma 2.7).*

(6) *If $\Phi(G) = 1$, then $O_{\pi'}(G) = 1$.*

Assume that $O_{\pi'}(G) \neq 1$ and let R be a minimal normal subgroup of G contained in $O_{\pi'}(G)$. Then $R \not\leq D$, so in view of the G -isomorphism $RD/D \simeq R$, R is cyclic. Since $\Phi(G) = 1$, for some

maximal subgroup M of G we have $RM = G$ and so G/M_G is supersoluble by Lemma 2.3. It follows that $D \leq M$ and hence M is supersoluble by Claim (2). But then $G = RM$ is supersoluble. This contradiction shows that we have (6).

(7) *If H is a complement to D in G , then $H\Phi(G)/\Phi(G)$ is either a Miller-Moreno group or an abelian group of prime power order.*

Without loss of generality we can assume that $\Phi(G) = 1$. First we shall show that every proper subgroup A of H is abelian. Let $C = C_G(F(G))$. Then $C \leq F(G)$ since G is soluble. On the other hand, Claim (4) implies that $F(G) \leq D$, so $C \leq D$. It follows that $F(DA) = F(G)$, so $AF(G)/F(G) \simeq A$ is abelian since DA is supersoluble by Claim (2). Therefore, if H is not abelian, then H is a Miller-Moreno group.

Finally, suppose that H is abelian. Then $G' \leq D$ by Claim (3), so Claim (5) implies that $|G : DG'| = |G : D| = |H|$ is a prime power number.

(8) *H is a Gaschütz subgroup of G .*

Since $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ and $G = D \rtimes H$, H is supersoluble. It is clear also that H is not $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal in G . Hence H is $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G by hypothesis. Therefore H is a Gaschütz subgroup of G since G is soluble by Claim (2).

(9) *If H is not a cyclic group of prime power order q^n , where $n > 1$, then D is nilpotent.*

Suppose that this is false and let $R \leq O_p(G)$ be a minimal normal subgroup of G .

(*) *$|H|$ is not a prime.*

Indeed, assume that $H = \langle a \rangle$, where $|a|$ is a prime. Since H is a Gaschütz subgroup of G , $N_G(H) = H$ and hence a induces a regular automorphism on D . Hence D is nilpotent by the Thompson's theorem [20, V, 8.14], a contradiction. Hence we have (*).

(**) *If $R \leq D$ or $R \leq \Phi(G)$, where R is a minimal normal subgroup of G , then DR/R is nilpotent. Hence $\Phi(G) = 1$, $R = F(D) = C_D(R)$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of G contained in D and R is the Sylow p -subgroup of G for some prime p .*

The choice of G and Claims (1) and (*) imply that in order to prove that DR/R is nilpotent, it is enough to show that HR/R is not a cyclic group of order q^n , where $n > 1$ and q is a prime. In the case when $R \leq D$ it is evident. Now assume that $R \leq \Phi(G) \cap H$. Then $R \not\leq D$ and hence $|R| = p$ for some prime p . Let G_p be a Sylow p -subgroup of H . Then G_p is a Sylow p -subgroup of G since H is a Hall subgroup of G by Claim (3). Suppose that $R \not\leq \Phi(H)$. Then for some maximal subgroup M of H we have $H = R \rtimes M$, so $G_p = R \rtimes (M \cap H)$. But then R has a complement in G by Gaschütz's Theorem [16, I, 17.4]. This contradiction shows that $R \leq \Phi(H)$. Suppose that H/R is cyclic. Then H is nilpotent and so $\Phi(H)$ is a maximal subgroup of H . It follows that H is a cyclic group of order p^n , where $n > 1$, a contradiction. Therefore the hypothesis holds for G/R .

If $R \leq \Phi(G)$, then from Lemma 2.8 we deduce that D is nilpotent since $DR/R \simeq D$ is nilpotent,

a contradiction. Hence $\Phi(G) = 1$. Therefore $F(D)$ is the direct product of some minimal normal subgroups of G by Lemma 2.3 since $\Phi(F(G)) \leq \Phi(G) = 1$. If G has a minimal normal subgroup $L \neq R$ such that $L \leq D$, then $D \simeq D/1 = D/R \cap L$ is nilpotent. Therefore R is the unique minimal normal subgroup of G contained in D . Therefore $R = F(D) = C_D(R)$. Finally, since D is supersoluble, a Sylow p -subgroup P of G , where p is the largest prime dividing $|D|$, is normal in D and so $P \leq C_D(R) = R$. Hence R is the Sylow p -subgroup of D , so R is the Sylow p -subgroup of G since D is a Hall subgroup of G by Claim (3).

(***) $R = C_G(R)$. Hence $F(G) = R$.

Let $C = C_G(R)$ and S be a p -complement of C . Then, in view of Claim (**), $C = R \times S$ is normal in G and so S and $S \cap D$ are normal in G . Therefore Claim (**) implies that $S \cap D = 1$. Therefore $S \leq O_{\pi'}(G) = 1$ by Claim (6). Hence $C = C_G(R)$.

Final contradiction for (9). First assume that H is a q -group for some prime q and V and W are different maximal subgroups of H . Then DV and DW are supersoluble by Claim (2) and $G = DVW = (DV)(DW)$. Hence G is metanilpotent and then G/R is nilpotent by Claim (***). Hence $D = R$ is nilpotent. This contradiction shows that $H = AB$, where A is a Sylow q -subgroup of H for some prime q dividing $|H|$ and $B \neq 1$ is a q -complement of H . Let S be a p -complement of D such that $SB = BS$. Then $DB/F(DB) = DB/R \simeq SB$ is abelian. Hence $|G : C_G(S)|$ is a $\{p, q\}$ -number. Similarly, one can obtain that $|G : C_G(S)|$ is a $(\{p\} \cup \{q'\})$ -number. Hence $|G : C_G(S)|$ is a power of p . Therefore a p -complement of G is supersoluble, which implies that $D = R$, a contradiction. Hence we have (9).

(10) Every chief factor K/L of G below D is non-cyclic.

If $L \neq 1$, it is true by Claim (1) and the choice of G . On the other hand, in the case when $L = 1$ K is not cyclic by Claim (8).

From Claims (1)–(10) it follows that Assertions (i)–(vi) are true for G , which contradicts the choice of G . This completes the proof of the necessity.

Sufficiency. Let A be a non-identity subgroup of G . We shall show that A is either $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal or $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G . It is clear that $A = V \rtimes W$, where $V = A \cap D$ and W is a Hall π' -subgroup of H . Moreover, since G is soluble and H is a Hall π' -subgroup of G , we can assume without loss of generality that $W \leq H$ and so $A = (A \cap D)(A \cap H)$. If $H \leq A$, then A is $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G since H is a Gaschütz subgroup of G by hypothesis. Assume that $A \cap H < H$ and let $E = D(A \cap H)$. Then E is $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal in G and E is supersoluble by Assertion (vi). Hence A is $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal in G by Lemma 2.1(3).

Proof of Theorem B. Necessity. Suppose that this is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Then $\Phi \neq D$ and, in view of Theorem A, $\Phi \neq 1$.

(1) Assertions (i)–(vi) in Theorem A are true for G/Φ . Moreover, Assertions (iii)–(vi) in Theorem A are true for G/R for any non-identity normal subgroup R of G not containing D .

First note that $\Phi(G/\Phi) \cap (G/\Phi)^{\mathfrak{U}} = (\Phi(G)/\Phi) \cap (D/\Phi) = (\Phi(G) \cap D)/\Phi = 1$, so G/Φ is an $E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ -group by Lemma 2.1(2). Therefore Assertions (i)–(vi) in Theorem A are true for G/Φ . In order to prove the second assertion of (1), it is enough to show that the hypothesis holds for G/R . First note that $G/R \notin \mathfrak{U}$ since $D \not\leq R$ by our hypothesis on R . Let A/R be a subgroup of G/R containing $\Phi(G/R) \cap (G/R)^{\mathfrak{U}} = \Phi(G/R) \cap (DR/R)$. Then, since $\Phi R/R \leq \Phi(G/R)$, A contains Φ and so A is either $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal or $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G . Hence A/R is either $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal or $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G/R by Lemma 2.1(2). Therefore the hypothesis holds for G/R for any normal subgroup R of G not containing D .

(2) $G = D \rtimes H$ is a soluble group, where H is a Hall subgroup of G such that $H\Phi/\Phi$ is a Gaschütz subgroup of G/Φ .

From Claim (1) we get that $D/\Phi = (G/\Phi)^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a Hall subgroup of G . Therefore G is soluble. It follows also that Φ is the Sylow p -subgroup of D for some prime p and a p -complement S of D is a Hall subgroup of G .

Since $\Phi \leq \Phi(G)$, from Lemma 2.8 it follows that $D = R \times S$. Hence for some minimal normal subgroup L of G we have $L \leq S$ since $\Phi \neq D$. Then $D/L = (G/L)^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a Hall subgroup of G by Claim (1) and hence Φ is a Sylow subgroup of G . But this is impossible since $\Phi \leq \Phi(G)$. Hence D is a Hall subgroup of G , so D has a complement H in G . It is clear that $H\Phi/\Phi$ is a complement to $D/\Phi = (G/\Phi)^{\mathfrak{U}}$ in G/Φ , so $H\Phi/\Phi$ is a Gaschütz subgroup of G/Φ since Assertion (i) in Theorem A is true for G/Φ by Claim (1).

(3) Assertion (iii) in Theorem A is true for G .

Indeed, from Claim (1) we get that $|(G/\Phi) : (D/\Phi)(G'\Phi/\Phi)| = |G : DG'\Phi| = |G : DG'|$ since $\Phi \leq D$.

(4) Assertion (iv) in Theorem A is true for G .

By Claim (1), D/Φ is nilpotent. But then D is nilpotent by Lemma 2.8.

(5) Assertion (v) in Theorem A is true for G (This directly follows from Claim (1)).

(6) Assertion (vi) in Theorem A is true for G .

Let E be any proper subgroup of G containing D . We shall show that E is supersoluble. Suppose that this is false. Let R be a minimal normal subgroup of G contained in D . Then $D/R = (G/R)^{\mathfrak{U}} \leq E/R < G/R$. Hence E/R is supersoluble by Claim (1). Moreover, E/Φ is supersoluble by the same Claim, so in the case when H is abelian E is supersoluble by Lemma 2.8. Hence H is not abelian. In this case D is nilpotent by Claim (1). If G has a minimal normal subgroup $L \neq R$ such that $L \leq D$, then $E \simeq E/R \cap L$ is supersoluble. Therefore R is the only minimal normal subgroup of G contained in D . Hence D is a Sylow p -group of G for some prime p . Suppose that $R \leq \Phi(D)$. Then $E/\Phi(D)$ is supersoluble. Moreover, $\Phi(D) \leq \Phi(E)$ since D is normal in E and hence E is supersoluble. Therefore $\Phi(D) = 1$, so $R = D$ by the Maschke's Theorem. But then $\Phi = 1$, a contradiction. Hence we have (6).

From Claims (2)–(6) it follows that the necessity conditions of the theorem are true for G , which contradicts the choice of G . This completes the proof of the necessity.

The sufficiency condition in the theorem directly follows from Theorem A.

4 Final remarks

1. The structure of $\mathfrak{U}$ -critical groups are well-known [10, 11]. In particular, the supersoluble residual of $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ of an $\mathfrak{U}$ -critical group G is a Sylow subgroup of G . This observation and Theorem A are motivations for the following question: *Let G be an $E_{\mathfrak{U}}$ -group. Is it true then that $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a Sylow subgroup of G or, at least, the number $|\pi(G^{\mathfrak{U}})|$ is limited to the top?*

The following elementary example shows that the answer to this question is negative.

Example 4.1. Let $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_n < p$ be a set of primes, B a group of order p and P_i a simple $\mathbb{F}_{p_i}B$ -module which is faithful for B . Let $A_i = P_i \rtimes B$ and $G = (\dots((A_1 \rtimes A_2) \rtimes A_3) \rtimes \dots) \rtimes A_n$ (see [16, p. 50]). Then G is an $E_{\mathfrak{U}}$ -group, $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = P_1 P_2 \dots P_n$ and $|G/G^{\mathfrak{U}}| = p$.

2. The following example shows that the subgroup D in Theorem A is not necessary nilpotent.

Example 4.2. Let $H = H_2 \rtimes H_3$ is a 2-closed Schmidt group, where H_2 is a Sylow 2-subgroup of G and $H_3 = \langle a \rangle$ a cyclic sylow 3-subgroup of G . Then, by [2, B, 10.7], there exists a simple $\mathbb{F}_7 H$ -module P which is faithful for H . Let $G = P \rtimes H$. It is no difficult to show that G is an $E_{\mathfrak{U}}$ -group and $G^{\mathfrak{U}} = P H_2$ is non-nilpotent.

3. It is also not difficult to show that the subgroup H in Theorem A is not necessary cyclic.

4. We do not know the answer to the following question: *What is the structure of the group G provided that each nontrivial nilpotent subgroup of G is either $\mathfrak{U}$ -subnormal or or $\mathfrak{U}$ -abnormal in G ?*

5. Partially, the results of this paper were announced in [21].

References

- [1] L.A. Shemetkov, *Formations of finite groups*, Moscow, Nauka, Main Editorial Board for Physical and Mathematical Literature, 1978.
- [2] K. Doerk, T. Hawkes, *Finite Soluble Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1992.
- [3] G. Ebert, S. Bauman, A note on subnormal and abnormal chains, *J. Algebra*, **36**(2) (1975), 287–293.
- [4] A. Fattahi, Groups with only normal and abnormal subgroups, *J. Algebra*, **28**(1) (1974), 15–19.
- [5] P. Förster, Finite groups all of whose subgroups are $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal or or $\mathfrak{F}$ -subabnormal, *J. Algebra*, **103**(1) (1986), 285–293.

- [6] V.N. Semenchuk, The structure of finite groups with the $\mathfrak{F}$ -abnormal or $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal subgroups, in "Questions of Algebra", Minsk: Publishing House "University" , **2** (1986), 50–55.
- [7] V.N. Semenchuk, Finite groups with f -abnormal and f -subnormal subgroups, *Mat. Zametki*, **55**(6) (1994), 111–115.
- [8] V.N. Semenchuk, S.H. Shevchuk, Finite groups whose primary subgroups are $\mathfrak{F}$ -abnormal or $\mathfrak{F}$ -subnormal, *Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Mathematics*, **11** (2011), 46–55.
- [9] R. Carter, T. Hawkes, The $\mathfrak{F}$ -normalizers of a finite soluble group, *J. Algebra*, **5**(2) (1967), 175–202.
- [10] B. Huppert, Normalteiler and maximale Untergruppen endlicher Gruppen, *Math. Z.*, **60** (1954), 409–434.
- [11] K. Doerk, Minimal nicht uberauflösbar, endliche Gruppen, *Math. Z.*, **91** (1966), 198–205.
- [12] L.A. Shemetkov, A.N. Skiba, Formations of Algebraic Systems, Nauka, Main Editorial Board for Physical and Mathematical Literature, Moscow, 1989.
- [13] W. Guo, *The Theory of Classes of Groups*, Science Press-Kluwer Academic Publishers, Beijing–New York–Dordrecht–Boston–London, 2000.
- [14] A. Ballester-Bolínches, L.M. Ezquerro, *Classes of Finite groups*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.
- [15] W. Guo, A.N. Skiba, On $\mathfrak{F}\phi^*$ -hypercentral subgroups of finite groups, *J. Algebra*, **372** (2012), 275–292.
- [16] B. Huppert, *Endliche Gruppen I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1967.
- [17] M. Weinstein (ed.), et al., *Between Nilpotent and Solvable*, Polygonal Publishing House, Passaic N. J., 1982.
- [18] A.F.Vasil'ev, T.I. Vasil'eva, V.N.Tyutyanov, On the finite groups of supersoluble type, *Sib. Math. J.*, **51**(6) (2010), 1004–1012.
- [19] A.F.Vasil'ev, T.I. Vasil'eva, V.N.Tyutyanov, On the products of $\mathbb{P}$ -subnormal subgroups of finite groups, *Sib. Math. J.*, **51**(6) (2012), 47–54.
- [20] B. Huppert, N. Blackburn, *Finite Groups II*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New-York, 1982.
- [21] V.N. Semenchuk, Finite groups with generalized subnormal formation subgroups, *Proc. Fr. Skorina Gomel St. Univ.*, **84**(3) (2014), 104–107.